Application No. 10/516,384 Amendment dated April 3, 2008 Reply to Office Action of January 3, 2008

REMARKS

This paper is filed in response to the official action dated October 3, 2007 (hereafter, "the official action"). This paper is timely filed as it is accompanied by a petition for extension of time and authorization to charge our credit card account in the amount of the requisite fee. The Director is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in the fees filed, asserted to be filed or which should have been filed herewith to our Deposit Account No. 13-2855, under Order No. 30869/40704.

Claims 1-10 are pending. By the foregoing, claims 1-10 have been amended for clarity. No new matter has been added.

Claims 9 and 10 have been rejected as indefinite. The applicants submit that these rejections have been overcome by the present amendments which positively recite method steps.

Additionally, claims 1-8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by Gonsalves, U.S. Patent No. 7,008,749 ("Gonsalves").

Gonsalves discloses a copolymer comprising a polyhedral silsesquioxane, the silsesquioxane including a substituent R, which may be an alkyl substituent. *See* Gonsalvesat column 6, lines 33-38.

Claims 1-5 and 7-10 recite either substituents containing up to 3 carbon atoms or comprising ethyl groups. Such substituents are not disclosed by Gonsalves.

Claim 6 recites exposing a lithographic material containing a polymer bearing at least one polyhedral oligomeric silsesquioxane group to 157 nm radiation. Such a step is not disclosed in Gonsalves.

It is well-established that each and every limitation of a claimed invention must be present in a single prior art reference in order for anticipation to occur. *See*, for example, C.R. Bard, Inc. v. M3 Systems, Inc., 157 F.3d 1340, 1349 (Fed. Cir. 1998). This standard has not been satisfied with respect to the pending claims. Accordingly, the anticipation rejections are improper and should be withdrawn.

Furthermore, the claimed materials have substantial advantages as shown in the examples. As a result, the structure produced in accordance with the examples is smooth

Reply to Office Action of January 3, 2008

with low roughness after plasma etching. Therefore, the invention achieves very smooth structures after plasma treatment.

Additionally, the use of small alkyl sustituents in accordance with the claims offers an additional advantage in that it leads to small absorbance values, which are desirable.

Accordingly, the claimed materials and processes are neither disclosed nor suggested by Gonsalves.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Should the examiner wish to discuss the foregoing, or any matter of form or procedure in an effort to advance this application to allowance, he is respectfully invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number.

Dated: April 3, 2008

Sh. ..

Respectfully submitted,

Andrew M. Lawrence

Registration No.: 46,130

MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP

Docket No.: 30848/40704

233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 6300

Sears Tower

Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357

(312) 474-6300

Attorney for Applicants